

INTERNET DOCUMENT INFORMATION FORM

A . Report Title: Evaluation Report on the Joint Communications Support Element

B. DATE Report Downloaded From the Internet: 10/20/99

C. Report's Point of Contact: (Name, Organization, Address, Office Symbol, & Ph #):
OAG-AUD (ATTN: AFTS Audit Suggestions)
Inspector General, Department of Defense
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, VA 22202-2884

D. Currently Applicable Classification Level: Unclassified

E. Distribution Statement A: Approved for Public Release

F. The foregoing information was compiled and provided by:
DTIC-OCA, Initials: __VM__ Preparation Date 10/20/99

The foregoing information should exactly correspond to the Title, Report Number, and the Date on the accompanying report document. If there are mismatches, or other questions, contact the above OCA Representative for resolution.

19991021 062

Evaluation



Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

**EVALUATION REPORT ON THE
JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT ELEMENT**

Report No. 97-167

June 19, 1997

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Additional Copies

To obtain additional copies of this evaluation report, contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit of the Analysis, Planning, and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or FAX (703) 604-8932.

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch of the Analysis, Planning, and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8939 (DSN 664-8939) or FAX (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

OAIG-AUD (ATTN: APTS Audit Suggestions)
Inspector General, Department of Defense
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, Virginia 22202-2884

Defense Hotline

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, contact the Defense Hotline by calling (800) 424-9098; by sending an electronic message to Hotline@DODIG.OSD.MIL; or by writing to the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

Acronyms

C4	Command, Control, Communications, and Computers
CINC	Commander in Chief
CJCS	Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
JCSE	Joint Communications Support Element
JCSS	Joint Communications Support Squadron
TRO	Training and Readiness Oversight
USACOM	U.S. Atlantic Command
USCENTCOM	U.S. Central Command
USPACOM	U.S. Pacific Command



**INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884**



June 19, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, JOINT STAFF

**SUBJECT: Evaluation Report on the Joint Communications Support Element
(Report No. 97-167)**

We are providing this draft report for information and use. We considered management comments on a draft of this report when preparing the final report.

The Joint Staff comments conformed to the requirements of DoD Directive 7650.3; therefore, additional comments are not required.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the evaluation staff. Questions on the evaluation should be directed to Captain A. L. Lawson, U.S. Navy, Evaluation Program Director, at (703) 604-9555 (DSN 664-9555) or Ms. Kathryn Palmer, Evaluation Project Manager, at (703) 604-9551 (DSN 664-9551). See Appendix E for the report distribution. The evaluation team members are listed inside the back cover.

Robert J. Lieberman
Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. 97-167
(Project No. 6RB-0081)

June 19, 1997

Joint Communications Support Element

Executive Summary

Introduction. The Joint Communications Support Element (JCSE) is a rapidly deployable, joint tactical communications unit and is operationally controlled by the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. The JCSE is augmented by two Joint Communications Support Squadrons of the Air National Guard. The greater JCSE, comprised of the combined active duty and Air National Guard components, deploys worldwide, supporting the unified commands, DoD agencies, the Services, and selected foreign governments on crisis, contingency, wartime, and disaster relief missions. The greater JCSE provides secure voice and data communications that link deployed commanders to their components' headquarters, higher headquarters, and the National Command Authorities.

Evaluation Objectives. The overall evaluation objective was to determine the effectiveness of the JCSE in providing communications support for the National Command Authorities; the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and the commanders in chief of the unified commands. Specifically, we determined whether JCSE assets were employed in activities that matched the JCSE stated mission. We also evaluated the JCSE ability to provide effective support to its customers. In addition, we evaluated the management control program related to the overall objective.

Evaluation Results. The Joint Communications Support Element was effectively accomplishing its mission (Appendix C). However, the draft "Forces For Unified Commands" memorandum assigns the Joint Communications Support Squadrons to the U.S. Atlantic Command, fragmenting the oversight structure of the JCSE. Assigning the Joint Communications Support Squadrons to one unified command while the JCSE remains under the administrative oversight of another command could create different and potentially conflicting oversight decisions for the components of the JCSE. Also, a fragmented oversight structure may impair the readiness of the Joint Communications Support Squadrons to respond to short-notice requirements as integral components of the greater JCSE.

Management controls applicable to the JCSE were adequate in that we identified no material weaknesses.

Summary of Recommendations. We recommend that the Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment (J-8), Joint Staff, reconsider the recommendation in the draft "Forces for Unified Commands" memorandum to assign oversight responsibilities to two unified commanders. The memorandum should instead consolidate oversight responsibilities for the greater JCSE under a single unified commander.

Management Comments. The Joint Staff concurred with the recommendation, stating that it will review the command arrangement and the assignment of the Joint Communications Support Squadrons as part of the staffing of the FY 1998 "Forces For Unified Commands" memorandum. Further, the exceptions cited in the report (that is,

the assignment of certain forces based in the continental United States to U.S. Pacific Command) are evaluated on a case-by-case basis and are reviewed annually. The general rule is still to assign all forces operating within a geographic area to the unified commander responsible for that area.

The U.S. Pacific Command also commented, recommending changes to Appendix C regarding exercises and JCSE exercise support. The command also recommended that Appendix D emphasize the high costs of deploying JCSE even when the transition of JCSE support is not exercised. In addition, the command recommended that the cost estimates in Appendix D reflect JCSE transportation costs from MacDill Air Force Base rather than from Travis Air Force Base. The command stated that our estimate was understated due to the difference in transportation costs from MacDill Air Force Base rather than Travis Air Force Base.

See Part I for a complete discussion of managements' comments and Part III for the complete texts of those comments.

Evaluation Response: The evaluation did not address Joint Staff mechanisms for evaluating and reviewing exceptions to its general policies for assigning forces. The report discusses assigning certain forces based in the continental United States to the U.S. Pacific Command only to show that exceptions already exist to the geographic assignment of forces to a particular command. The Joint Staff's reconsideration of the assignment issue may result in the need for a similar exception for the Joint Communications Support Squadrons.

We revised Appendix C in response to the U.S. Pacific Command's comments. However, the inclusion of additional cost information in Appendix D would not change the fact that exercising the transition of JCSE support could double the costs of the exercise. Appendix D depicts only an estimate of how exercising the transition of JCSE support would affect the costs of a notional exercise. Appendix D is not intended to provide a detailed estimate of overall exercise costs.

No additional comments are required.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Part I - Evaluation Results	
Evaluation Background	2
Evaluation Objectives	3
Assignment of the Joint Communications Support Squadrons	4
Part II - Additional Information	
Appendix A. Evaluation Process	
Scope and Methodology	12
Management Control Program Review	13
Appendix B. Summary of Prior Coverage	14
Appendix C. JCSE Mission Accomplishment	15
Appendix D. Other Matters of Interest	16
Appendix E. Report Distribution	19
Part III - Management Comments	
Joint Staff Comments	22
U.S. Pacific Command Comments	24

Part I - Evaluation Results

Evaluation Background

The Joint Communications Support Element (JCSE) is a rapidly deployable, joint tactical communications unit operationally controlled by the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS). The JCSE is augmented by two Joint Communications Support Squadrons (JCSSs) of the Air National Guard. The "greater" JCSE, comprised of the combined active duty and Air National Guard components, deploys worldwide supporting the unified commands, DoD agencies, the Services, and selected foreign governments on crisis, contingency, wartime, and disaster relief missions. The JCSE provides secure voice and data communications that link deployed commanders to their components' headquarters, higher headquarters, and the National Command Authorities.

Unit History. The JCSE was formed in 1962 as the Communications Support Element to support the U.S. Strike Command as a dedicated communications resource. In 1972, after the U.S. Strike Command was reorganized as the U.S. Readiness Command, the Communications Support Element became the JCSE. At that time, the JCSE was placed under the operational control of the CJCS, but remained attached to the U.S. Readiness Command for logistical and administrative support. In December 1984, the Air Force selected and redesignated two Air National Guard combat communications squadrons as JCSSs to augment the active JCSE. In May 1987, the U.S. Readiness Command dissolved and the JCSE was assigned to the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) for administrative support.

Current Mission. The greater JCSE mission is to provide simultaneous communications support for two joint task force headquarters and for two joint special operations task force headquarters. The mission of the greater JCSE and the role of the JCSSs have not changed since 1985.

Greater JCSE Structure. The JCSE is located at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, and is made up of about 460 active duty personnel from the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. The JCSE Air National Guard component is composed of the 224th JCSS (Brunswick, Georgia) and the 290th JCSS (MacDill Air Force Base, Florida), each of which has about 240 personnel. The JCSSs are unique for Air National Guard units in that their sole Federal mission is to support the joint mission of the greater JCSE and, in so doing, are under the operational control of the CJCS.

Oversight and Use. CJCS Instruction 6110.01, "CJCS-Controlled Tactical Communications Assets," January 25, 1996, governs the policy and use of the greater JCSE. The Instruction specifies that CJCS-controlled communications assets (for example, the JCSE) will be maintained in a high state of readiness to respond to no-notice and short-notice requirements. The Instruction also specifies that the deployment and redeployment of greater JCSE elements will not exceed 45 days. The intent of that limitation is to ensure the greater JCSE strategic response capability by requiring it to be replaced by Service component communications units.

Evaluation Objectives

The overall evaluation objective was to determine the effectiveness of the JCSE in providing communications support for the National Command Authorities, the CJCS, and the commanders in chief (CINCs) of the unified commands. Specifically, we determined whether JCSE assets were employed in activities that matched the JCSE stated mission. We also evaluated the JCSE ability to provide effective support to its customers. In addition, we evaluated the management control program related to the overall objective. See Appendix A for a discussion of the evaluation scope and methodology and the review of the management control program. Appendix B summarizes prior coverage related to the evaluation objectives.

Assignment of the Joint Communications Support Squadrons

The draft "Forces for Unified Commands" memorandum assigns the JCSSs to the U.S. Atlantic Command (USACOM), fragmenting the oversight structure of the JCSE. Assigning the JCSSs to one unified command while the JCSE remains under the administrative oversight of another command could create different and potentially conflicting oversight decisions for the components of the JCSE. A fragmented oversight structure may impair the readiness of the JCSSs to respond to short-notice requirements as integral components of the greater JCSE.

Assignment of Forces

Joint Staff Proposal. The Joint Staff recommended in the draft FY 1997 "Forces for Unified Commands" memorandum, which is prepared for the Secretary of Defense, that the JCSSs be assigned to USACOM. The Joint Staff position is intended to support the USACOM formal role as the joint force integrator.¹

Legal Requirement. The DoD Reorganization Act of 1986 (the Goldwater-Nichols Act) required the Secretaries of the Military Departments to assign all forces under their jurisdictions to unified commands as directed by the Secretary of Defense.² Since February 1987, the Secretary of Defense has directed force assignments in "Forces for Unified Commands" memorandums. Within the Joint Staff, the Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment (J-8) prepares and coordinates the memorandum on behalf of the CJCS for the approval of the Secretary of Defense. Until the draft FY 1997 "Forces for Unified Commands" memorandum, the JCSSs had not been assigned to a unified command because the DoD had not established a clear policy concerning the assignment of Reserve component units.

Combatant Command Authority. Each unified commander exercises combatant command authority over assigned units designated in the "Forces for Unified Commands" memorandum. The unified commander exercises

¹USACOM is responsible for the joint training of continental United States-based forces and staffs assigned to joint task forces and to provide jointly trained and ready forces for worldwide employment as directed by the National Command Authorities.

²Certain forces are exempt from the requirement to be assigned to a unified commander, principally those organizations performing Military Department functions and joint organizations, such as the JCSE.

combatant command authority³ over active forces at all times and over assigned Reserve component forces when they are mobilized or ordered to active duty.

Training and Readiness Oversight Authority. On September 6, 1996, the Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum to clarify DoD policy concerning the assignment of Reserve component units to combatant commands. The memorandum delineates the authority a unified commander has over assigned Reserve component forces (such as the JCSSs) when not on active duty or when on active duty for training. The Secretary established the concept of Training and Readiness Oversight (TRO) authority. The TRO authority grants a unified commander the right to coordinate the participation of assigned Reserve component forces in joint exercises and to provide guidance on operational requirements and priorities concerning the training and readiness programs for those forces. In addition, a unified commander may comment on resource allocation issues concerning assigned Reserve component forces and will coordinate and review mobilization plans for those forces.

Supporting Analysis. We found no evidence that the Joint Staff based its decision to recommend the assignment of support and oversight for the active and Reserve components of the greater JCSE to two unified commands on an analysis of potential operational or cost benefits. Instead, the Joint Staff based its recommendation on a Joint Staff policy to assign forces based in the continental United States to USACOM to support that command's role as joint force integrator. However, the Joint Staff has not applied this policy in all cases; certain forces based in the continental United States continue to be assigned to the U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM) because of those forces' long-term historical relationship with that command.

Additional Oversight. Under the current arrangement, the Joint Staff and USCENTCOM provide combined oversight for the greater JCSE. The proposed assignment of the JCSSs to USACOM would add a second unified command to provide oversight to the greater JCSE and to exercise TRO authority over the JCSSs.

Current Oversight Arrangements

The greater JCSE has been effective in accomplishing its mission under the current oversight mechanisms as discussed in detail in Appendix C. The Joint Staff and USCENTCOM both play important roles in guiding and supporting the JCSSs in performing their Federal mission.

³Combatant command authority includes the command function of coordinating and approving those aspects of administration and support (including control of resources and equipment, internal organization, and training) and discipline of assigned forces necessary to carry out missions assigned to the combatant command.

Assignment of the Joint Communications Support Squadrons

Joint Staff Role. As part of the greater JCSE, the JCSSs are designated CJCS-controlled tactical communications assets when exercising their Federal missions. Accordingly, the Joint Staff exercises deployment control of the JCSSs through the JCSE. Any unified command can request the support of the JCSE in exercises or operations, but that support must be approved by the CJCS. In addition, the Director for Command, Control, Communications, and Computer Systems (J-6), Joint Staff, is responsible for administering issues that affect the capabilities of the JCSSs in performing their Federal missions. The J-6 oversees the development of the JCSE procurement program, to include requirements identification and validation and obtaining Service funding for the procurement program. The procurement program includes equipment for the JCSSs.

USCENTCOM Role. In 1987, the Joint Staff delegated to USCENTCOM administrative support responsibilities for the JCSE. Accordingly, the USCENTCOM supports the JCSSs in a number of areas. The USCENTCOM:

- o programs and provides Operation and Maintenance funding for the JCSSs;

- o conducts general management inspections of the JCSSs;

- o assists in the execution of mobilization plans;

- o provides workdays for Air National Guard augmentation to the JCSE;

and

- o monitors training and combat readiness of the JCSSs through an Air National Guard advisor to the Director for Command and Control Communications and Computer Systems, USCENTCOM.⁴

Implications of the Proposed Assignment

Assigning the JCSSs to one unified command while the JCSE remains under the administrative oversight of another could create different and potentially conflicting oversight mechanisms for the active duty and Air National Guard components of the greater JCSE. Conflicting oversight has the potential to impair the readiness of the greater JCSE.

Deployment Control. TRO authority gives the unified commander the right to coordinate and approve participation by Reserve component forces in joint

⁴USCENTCOM responsibilities are delineated in CJCS Instruction 6110.01 and in a memorandum of understanding for the Joint Staff, USCENTCOM, the National Guard Bureau, the U.S. Air Force, the Air Combat Command, and the States of Georgia and Florida.

exercises and operations. In the case of the JCSSs, TRO authority exercised by the unified commander would be redundant because the Joint Staff exercises deployment control for CJCS-controlled assets.

JCSE Procurement Program and Budget. TRO authority includes the right to provide guidance on operational requirements and priorities concerning the training and readiness programs for assigned forces. In addition, TRO authority includes the right to comment on program recommendations and budget requests for assigned forces. In the case of the JCSSs, TRO authority exercised by the unified commander could conflict with the authority exercised by the Joint Staff and USCENTCOM. The Joint Staff oversees the development of the JCSE procurement program, to include requirements identification and validation, and obtains Service funding for the program. The JCSE procurement program includes equipment for the JCSSs. The USCENTCOM programs and provides Operation and Maintenance funding for the greater JCSE, including the JCSSs. USCENTCOM also provides workdays for Air National Guard augmentation to the JCSE.

Readiness Oversight. TRO authority provides the unified commander with the right to obtain and review readiness and inspection reports on assigned Reserve component forces. In addition, TRO authority includes providing guidance on operational requirements and priorities concerning the training and readiness programs for assigned forces. In the case of the JCSSs, TRO authority exercised by the unified commander would overlap readiness oversight already exercised by USCENTCOM. Under the current oversight arrangement, the Air National Guard advisor to the Director for Command and Control Communications and Computer Systems, USCENTCOM, already monitors training and combat readiness of the JCSSs. Further, the Inspector General, USCENTCOM, conducts general management inspections of the two JCSSs.

Unique Nature of the JCSSs

Fragmenting the oversight of the active and Air National Guard components of JCSE ignores the unique relationship and mission of the greater JCSE.

Joint Mission. Although legally considered Air National Guard assets, the JCSSs are joint units in practice. The sole Federal mission of the JCSSs is to augment the active JCSE in providing command, control, communications, and computers (C4) support for the deployed headquarters of joint task forces and joint special operations task forces. The organization and equipment of the JCSSs mirror the active JCSE rather than that typical of a Service-level communications unit.

CJCS Control. Indicative of their close integration with the JCSE, the JCSSs are designated CJCS-controlled tactical communications assets when exercising their Federal missions. Such units are considered critically important to the dissemination of national policy, objectives, and directives. Consequently, the CJCS controls and allocates use of the JCSSs.

Conclusion

There is no evidence of operational or economic benefit to assigning the JCSSs to a unified command different from the one that provides administrative oversight and support to the active JCSE. The mission of the greater JCSE and the integral roles played by the JCSSs have not changed so as to provide the basis for changing the existing oversight arrangement. In addition, the proposed organizational alignment could impair the readiness of the JCSSs as integral components of the greater JCSE.

Recommendation, Management Comments, and Evaluation Response

We recommend that the Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment (J-8), Joint Staff, reconsider his recommendation in the draft "Forces For Unified Commands" memorandum to assign oversight responsibilities to two unified commanders. The memorandum should instead consolidate oversight responsibilities for the greater Joint Communications Support Element under a single unified commander.

Management Comments. The Joint Staff concurred with the recommendation, stating that it will review the command arrangement and the assignment of the JCSSs as part of the staffing of the FY 1998 "Forces For Unified Commands" memorandum. The Joint Staff further stated that the exceptions cited in the report (that is, the assignment of certain forces based in the continental United States to USPACOM) are evaluated on a case-by-case basis and are reviewed annually. The Joint Staff indicated that the general rule is still to assign all forces operating within a geographic area to the unified commander responsible for that area.

Evaluation Response. The evaluation did not address Joint Staff mechanisms for evaluating and reviewing exceptions to its general policies for assigning forces. The report discusses assigning certain forces based in the continental United States to USPACOM only to show that exceptions already exist to the geographic assignment of forces to a particular command. The Joint Staff's reconsideration of the assignment issue may result in the need for a similar exception for the JCSSs.

USPACOM Comments. Although not required to comment, USPACOM recommended changes to Appendix C regarding exercises and JCSE exercise support. The USPACOM also recommended that Appendix D emphasize the high costs of deploying JCSE, even when the transition of JCSE support is not exercised. In addition, USPACOM recommended that the cost estimates in Appendix D reflect JCSE transportation costs from MacDill Air Force Base

Assignment of the Joint Communications Support Squadrons

rather than Travis Air Force Base. USPACOM commented that our estimate was understated due to the difference in transportation costs from MacDill Air Force Base rather than from Travis Air Force Base.

Evaluation Response. We revised Appendix C in response to the comments from USPACOM. However, the inclusion of additional cost information in Appendix D would not change the fact that exercising the transition of JCSE support could double the costs of the exercise. Appendix D depicts only an estimate of how exercising the transition of C4 support would affect the costs of a notional exercise. Appendix D is not intended to provide a detailed estimate of overall exercise costs.

This page was left out of original document

Part II - Additional Information

Appendix A. Evaluation Process

Scope and Methodology

We performed the evaluation from August 1996 to February 1997 and focused on the effectiveness of the JCSE in accomplishing its mission. We interviewed members of the Joint Staff, personnel from all five regional unified commands, and unit managers of the JCSE to include the Air National Guard components. We reviewed policies, procedures, and instructions pertaining to all aspects of the administration, maintenance, and use of the JCSE. We used the standards identified in those documents as criteria for measuring effectiveness. Documents reviewed included the following.

- o Planning and operations documents, dated from 1984 to 1996.
 - CJCS Instruction 6110.01, "CJCS-Controlled Tactical Communications Assets," January 25, 1996.
 - CJCS Instruction 3110.10, "Command, Control, Communications and Computer (C4) Systems Supplement to the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan (JSCP) FY 96," December 22, 1995.
 - "Memorandum of Understanding Between the Joint Staff and the United States Central Command and the National Guard Bureau and the United States Air Force and the Air Combat Command and the State of Georgia and the State of Florida," October 1, 1995.
 - JCSE C4 Planners Guide, 1996.
- o Requirements determination documents.
 - JCSE Program Architecture.
 - Mission need statements.
 - Customer inputs to the JCSE annual procurement program.

- o Procurement documents.
 - JCSE approved procurement program.
 - Joint Interoperability Test Center certifications.

Finally, we interviewed JCSE customers and reviewed customer lessons learned and after-action reports, dated from 1991 to 1996, on military exercises to determine the effectiveness of the JCSE in meeting DoD requirements for communications support during planned exercises and short- or no-notice deployments.

Contacts During the Evaluation. We visited or contacted individuals and organizations within the DoD. Further details are available on request.

Management Control Program Review

DoD Directive 5010.38, "Management Control (MC) Program," August 26, 1996, requires DoD organizations to implement a comprehensive system for management control that provides reasonable assurance that programs are operating as intended and to evaluate the adequacy of the controls.

Scope of Review of the Management Control Program. We reviewed the adequacy of the management controls at the JCSE. Specifically, we reviewed controls associated with requirements determination, procurements, and communications architecture. Also, we reviewed JCSE vulnerability assessments and JCSE input to USCENTCOM annual statements of assurance.

Adequacy of Management Controls. Management Controls applicable to JCSE were adequate in that we identified no material weaknesses.

Appendix B. Summary of Prior Coverage

U.S. Central Command

A general management inspection of the 290th JCSS, September 16, 1996, covered the following functional elements of the squadron: general military, security, automatic data processing equipment management, financial management, personnel, maintenance, recall procedures, and communications operations. The USCENTCOM gave the 290th JCSS an overall rating of outstanding.

A general management inspection of the JCSE, April 3, 1995, covered the following functional elements: general military, administration, personnel management, logistics, maintenance, unit operations, and company level operations. The USCENTCOM gave the JCSE an overall rating of excellent.

A general management inspection of the 224th JCSS, March 6, 1995, covered the following functional elements: operational readiness, administration, personnel management, logistics, maintenance, and operations. The USCENTCOM gave the 224th JCSS an overall rating of satisfactory.

Appendix C. JCSE Mission Accomplishment

The evaluation focused on determining the effectiveness of the JCSE in meeting the requirements of its customers. As part of that determination, we evaluated how well equipped the JCSE was to meet its mission, whether the intended customers were using the JCSE, and the readiness of the JCSSs to meet customer requirements.

Meeting Customer Requirements. The Joint Staff has established a well-defined and disciplined requirements and procurement program for the JCSE to ensure that all equipment procured for the JCSE meets customer needs and is interoperable with Service assets. First, the Joint Staff reviews JCSE customer requirements at an annual meeting. The meeting affords the Services and the unified commands an opportunity to influence future JCSE capabilities. Second, the JCSE does not procure or maintain any CINC-unique equipment. Third, the JCSE procurement program is tied directly to Service programs, and any deviation requires Joint Staff approval. Finally, the Joint Interoperability Test Center certifies all new JCSE equipment before it is distributed. We verified that the procurement, requirements, and testing processes were working as intended.

Broadening the Customer Base. In the past, the USCENTCOM has been the primary customer of JCSE. Of total deployed staff days during FYs 1994 and 1995, JCSE deployed staff days in support of the USCENTCOM totaled 28.8 percent and 59.5 percent, respectively. Although the JCSE remains a key element of USCENTCOM operational and planning efforts, the JCSE is increasing its support to other regional CINCs. As the overall drawdown of forces continues, the JCSE has become an essential component in U.S. Southern Command training and contingency plans. Specifically, 60 percent of U.S. Southern Command's concept plans require JCSE support. The JCSE staff also works with USPACOM planners to increase JCSE exposure in that theater. The JCSE participated in two USPACOM exercises, Tandem Thrust 97 and Cobra Gold 97.

Air National Guard Readiness. Members of the JCSSs stated that they are fully integrated into the greater JCSE. The training records support that position. The integration is achieved by including the JCSSs in JCSE training and readiness activities. During FYs 1994 and 1995, the JCSSs participated in more than 46 military exercises. Additionally, the JCSSs participate in the JCSE annual deployment of a complete joint task force support element. In FY 1997, members of the JCSSs augmented JCSE in supporting exercises for the USCENTCOM and USPACOM. Operationally, the JCSSs have participated in major JCSE deployments, such as Desert Storm and United Nations Operations in Somalia I. Customers at the unified commands expressed satisfaction with the quality of support provided by JCSS personnel.

Appendix D. Other Matters of Interest

During the evaluation, personnel familiar with communications operations during United Nations Operations in Somalia I indicated that problems were encountered with the transition from joint task force support provided by JCSE to support provided by Service communications units. The personnel indicated that difficulties in making the transition could inhibit customers from planning to use JCSE assets. Although the problems related to the transition occurred because of unique environmental factors that affected Service planning, we expanded our evaluation to include a review of factors that could affect customer willingness to use JCSE. Factors that could affect the transition of C4 support are discussed below.

The 45-Day Rule

JCSE provides C4 architectural support to the deployed headquarters of joint task forces and joint special operations task forces. To ensure the ready availability of that support, CJCS Instruction 6110.01, "CJCS-Controlled Tactical Communications Assets," January 25, 1996, states that JCSE deployments will not exceed 45 days, except when the USCENTCOM headquarters deploys. If an exercise or operation will extend beyond the 45 days the Joint Staff authorizes for the JCSE, the supported commander must plan to replace JCSE assets with Service component assets. In reality, the Joint Staff uses the 45-day rule as a planning guide, and the actual length of JCSE deployments are determined on a case-by-case basis.

Transition of C4 Support

C4 Support Planning. The experience of United Nations Operations in Somalia I showed that early and comprehensive planning is critical to ensure a smooth transition of communications support from the JCSE to the Service components. To avoid transition problems, the Joint Staff requires a plan for the replacement of JCSE assets by the 30th day of any exercise or deployment anticipated to extend beyond 45 days. Several vehicles exist that facilitate that planning. JCSE provides planning support teams that are specifically trained to resolve inter-Service communications issues. In addition, the USACOM, as the joint force integrator, plans to establish JCSE transition planning procedures in its Joint Task Force Standing Operating Procedures.

Interoperability of Equipment. Interoperability between JCSE and Service equipment could affect the transition of C4 support. To ensure JCSE interoperability with the Services, the Joint Staff has established a disciplined requirements process and sound procurement controls for the JCSE as described

in Appendix C. The JCSE procurement program is tied directly to Service programs, and any deviation requires Joint Staff approval. Interoperability is further assured by the Joint Interoperability Test Center. All new JCSE equipment is tested and certified as interoperable by the Joint Interoperability Test Center before the equipment is distributed. Customer interviews and our reviews of after-action reports indicated that those controls were working as intended.

Costs and Benefits of Exercising the Transition

Including the transition of C4 support in military exercises is a potential method of reducing the risk of problems during actual operations. Based on practicality and cost, however, we concluded that exercising the transition is unnecessary.

Exercise Realism. JCSE support to a customer is task organized. With the exception of providing an entire joint task force support element (which is done only once a year), JCSE customer requirements differ with each deployment. Therefore, devising a realistic, typical transfer exercise would be difficult.

Increased Exercise Costs. The cost of employing the JCSE is a major expenditure. Deploying the JCSE in addition to Service assets for the sole purpose of exercising a transition could double the cost of providing C4 support. The table below depicts the estimated transportation costs of deploying in-theater Service assets and of deploying JCSE assets from the continental United States to support a potential USPACOM exercise in Thailand.

Appendix D. Other Matters of Interest

Estimated Transportation Costs for a Potential Transition Exercise

<u>Provider of Assets</u>	<u>Flying Hours</u> ¹	<u>Cost</u> ²
JCSE ³	151.9	\$ 726,386
USPACOM ⁴	108.7	<u>519,803</u>
Total transportation costs		\$1,246,189

¹Flying hour estimates are for one-way airlift only.

²Cost is based on the C-141 aircraft hourly rate of \$4,782.

³JCSE flying hour estimate is based on Travis Air Force Base departure.

⁴We derived USPACOM flying hours using JCSE load factors.

The actual amount would be higher since Service units are typically heavier than the equivalent JCSE asset.

Appendix E. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology
 Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange
Under Secretary of Defense for Policy
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
 Deputy Chief Financial Officer
 Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)
Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)

Joint Staff

Director, Joint Staff
Director for Command, Control, Communications, and Computer Systems (J-6)
Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment (J-8)

Department of the Army

Chief, National Guard Bureau
 Inspector General, National Guard Bureau
Auditor General, Department of the Army

Department of the Navy

Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Navy

Department of the Air Force

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

Unified Commands

Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Southern Command
Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command

Other Defense Organizations

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Agency
Director, National Security Agency
Inspector General, National Security Agency
Inspector General, Defense Intelligence Agency
Commander, Joint Communications Support Element

Non-Defense Federal Organizations and Individuals

Office of Management and Budget
Technical Information Center, National Security and International Affairs Division,
General Accounting Office

Chairman and ranking minority member of each of the following congressional committees and subcommittees:

Senate Committee on Appropriations
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
Senate Committee on Armed Services
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
House Committee on Appropriations
House Subcommittee on National Security, Committee on Appropriations
House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
House Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology,
Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal
Justice, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
House Committee on National Security

Part III - Management Comments

Joint Staff Comments



THE JOINT STAFF
WASHINGTON, DC

Reply ZIP Code:
20318-0300

DJSM-489-97
4 June 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INSPECTOR GENERAL, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Subject: Evaluation Report on the Joint Communications Support Element
(Project No. 6RB-0081)

1. The Joint Staff appreciates the opportunity to review the draft of the subject report¹ and concurs subject to inclusion of the following comments:

a. The current assignment of the two Air National Guard (ANG) Joint Communications Support Squadrons (JCSS) to USACOM is the result of consensus of appropriate unified commanders and Services from staffing of the FY 1997 "Forces For Unified Commands" memorandum and reflects the first implementation of the Reserve Component Training and Readiness Oversight policy provided by the Secretary of Defense. The Joint Staff will review the command arrangement and the assignment of the ANG squadrons as part of the staffing of the FY 1998 "Forces For Unified Commands" memorandum. The estimated completion date of this review is December 1997.

b. The report states that the Inspector General found no evidence of an analysis of potential operational or cost benefits in the Joint Staff decision to assign support and oversight for the active and Reserve components of the greater Joint Communications Support Element to two unified commands. The report further states that the JCSS units were assigned to USACOM because they are based in USACOM's geographic area of responsibility, and that the geographic principle is not rigidly applied. The example cited is selected West Coast CONUS forces assigned to USPACOM. However, in amplification of the Inspector General report, the West Coast force assignments, which are based on the historical relationship between those forces and USPACOM, are evaluated on a case-by-case basis and are reviewed annually. In general, forces are assigned in accordance with the title 10 article 162 (a) requirement that states, "Except as otherwise directed by the Secretary of Defense, all forces operating within the geographic area assigned to a unified combatant command shall be assigned to, and under the command of, the commander of that command."

2. The Joint Staff point of contact is Lieutenant Commander Tom Ryan, J-8, Forces Division, 614-9765.



DENNIS C. HAYS
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy
Director, Joint Staff

Reference:

- 1 Office of the DOD Inspector General memorandum, 4 April 1997, "Evaluation Report on the Joint Communications Support Element (Project No. 6RB-0081)"

U.S. Pacific Command Comments

Final Report
Reference



COMMANDER IN CHIEF, U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND
(USCINCPAC)
CAMP H.M. SMITH, HAWAII 96861-4028

J053
7500 0146
Ser/
JUN 6 1997

To: Department of Defense Inspector General (AUD/ROS) (Attn: Ms. K. Palmer)
400 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, VA 22202-2884

Subj: USCINCPAC RESPONSE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSPECTOR
GENERAL (DODIG) DRAFT REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF JOINT
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT ELEMENT (JCSE) (PROJECT NO. 6RB-0081)

Ref: (a) DODIG ltr of 4 Apr 97

1. Reference (a) provided the DODIG draft report on the subject evaluation and requested USCINCPAC review and comments. The DODIG conducted Pacific Theater field work at USCINCPAC, DISA-PAC, SOCPAC and MARFORPAC during the period 2-11 October 1996.

2. The following comments were provided by the USCINCPAC J6 directorate:

a. P 13, Appendix C., "Broadening the Customer Base." Change the sixth sentence, "The JCSE staff also works with U.S. Pacific Command planners to reduce the cost of military exercise support and to increase JCSE exposure in that theater." to read "The JCSE staff also works with U.S. Pacific Command planners to increase JCSE exposure in that theater." Reason: accuracy. Little, if any, cost-saving measures have occurred.

b. P. 12, Appendix C., "Broadening the Customer Base." Change last sentence, "The JCSE will participate in two major, upcoming U.S. Pacific command exercises, Tandem Thrust and cobra Gold." to read, "The JCSE participated in U.S. Pacific Command exercises, Tandem Thrust 97 and Cobra Gold 97." Reason: accuracy. Both exercises have already occurred.

c. P. 13, Appendix C., "Air National Guard Readiness." In the fifth sentence, "In FY 1997, members of the JCSS will be incorporated into JCSE support for upcoming exercises in the Caribbean, Australia, and Thailand." It is not clear which exercises are referred. If the sentence refers to Tandem Thrust 97 and Cobra Gold 97, which have already taken place, then it should be specified. However, this Command is not aware of any JCSS participation in Pacific theater exercise. Reason: accuracy.

d. P. 16, "Costs/Benefits of Exercising the Transition." Emphasis in this paragraph is on costs of transitioning from JCSE to service component support. However, the same high costs of deploying JCSE apply even for exercise support less than 45 days, when no transition is planned. Recommend including emphasis on cost solely for JCSE deployment without transition. Reason: clarity.

e. P. 17, Chart, "Estimated Transportation Costs for a Potential Transition Exercise," note 3. Since JCSE does not deploy from Travis Air Force Base (AFB), California, but rather from their home base at MacDill AFB, Florida, the cost analysis provided is not realistic. Recommend JCSE "Flying Hours" and "Cost" represent the total distance traveled from MacDill AFB to Thailand. Reason: accuracy.

3. Questions to the USCINCPAC response should be directed to MAJ Domkowski, USAF, J6311 at DSN (315) 477-1063 or COL Killen, USA, J63 at DSN (315) 477-6689.

4. USCINCPAC point of contact is Mr. Wayson Lee at DSN (315) 477-1182 or commercial (808) 477-1182 or FAX 477-0535.


J. B. KOEHLER
Captain, SC, U.S. Navy
Comptroller

Evaluation Team Members

This report was produced by the Readiness and Operational Support Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD.

Thomas F. Gimble
Salvatore D. Guli
Captain A. Lee Lawson, U.S. Navy
Kathryn Palmer
R. Marvin Cox
Mark McDonough
Robert Paluck
Major Andrew Vonada, U.S. Marine Corps
Nancy C. Cipolla
Mary Cleary